

Date: Wed, 6 Apr 94 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #163
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 6 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 163

Today's Topics:

 Amateur Forwarding Rules Ammended
 CB interference and FCC...need help (3 msgs)
 FTP-able copy of AX.25 standard?
 Incentive Licensing (Fire Extinguisher)
 Question about ID'ing... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 5 Apr 94 11:08:19 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Amateur Forwarding Rules Ammended
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

[This discussion belongs in .policy; followups redirected.]

In article <\$arlz05.1994@ampr.org>, Marc B. Grant <marcbg@netcom.com> reposted
from the FCC:

>The licensee of the first forwarding station
>must either authenticate the identity of the station from which
>it accepts communications on behalf of the system, or accept
>accountability for the content of the message.

This is about the best that we could have gotten, given that the FCC demands
the ability to exact retribution on _someone_.

They've made it easy for even the first forwarding station to get out of

having to monitor every message, though: Notice the bit about authenticating the identity of the originating station? This tells me that, once a practical authentication protocol is implemented, the responsibility is placed squarely on the shoulders of the originator, where it belongs. This would most likely require validation of local BBS users, but that situation is very common in the landline BBS world, and it's stated policy among nearly all Internet providers that the identity of users of Internet-connected systems must be validated as well.

BBS authors, here's your chance.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"Something in Windows must give more than the recommended daily
allowance of the logical leap vitamin." -- Mike Dahmus

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 94 23:38:10 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Z0+MJPz.darrylb@delphi.com>, <darrylb@delphi.com> wrote:
>What can I do to help her? The FCC is obviously giving her the runaround.
>The CBer is interfering with her phone, television, and radios. Any comments
>here would be appreciated.

Not much, I'm afraid. The FCC has completely gotten out of the business of doing anything about interference. This is due, in part, to one fact that she's not going to like: Consumer electronics manufacturers are building shoddier equipment with every passing day. The vast majority of it does not even approach doing an adequate job of rejecting signals it's not supposed to receive.

If it's a CBer, then there's at least a good chance the guy's running illegal power, and those that do are notorious for generating terrible signals. Even so, the FCC has given up on regulating the CB band altogether except where they can't ignore gross violations.

Basically, you have no jurisdiction in the radio domain; that's the FCC's job. They're simply not doing anything, but that doesn't mean that you can.

If your area has regulations about tower height, you could see if he's within those...but that's not directly related to interference, nor should it be.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"The difference between baseball and politics is that, in baseball, if you get caught stealing, you're out!" -- Ed Shanks

Date: 6 Apr 94 06:20:10 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!cleveland.Freenet.Edu!
ak842@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare KA1CV)) says:

>darrylb@delphi.com wrote:
>
>
>: What can I do to help her? The FCC is obviously giving her the runaround.
>: The CBer is interferring with her phone, television, and radios. Any comments
>: here would be appreciated.
>
>It's unfortunate that it is not a ham; we could locate a local
>volunteer to help out.
>

Ha ha ha ha.... I'm actually quite amused by this. (The ARRL tends to amuse me anyways.) It's unfortunate, Ed, that local volunteers are powerless to do anything also! Let's face up to something. The OO's and Amateur Aux. are POWERLESS! The FCC isn't going to do anything about interference, and I doubt my local OO is going to march up and knock on some bozo's door and demand his rig at gunpoint.

So I guess that leads us to a question, Ed:
How exactly is this volunteer going to help out?

"Yup, he's interfering with that there telephone alright. I'll the FCC, wish there was something I could do."

So Mr. OO goes to his phone and does whatever it is OO's do, and eventually word gets to the FCC. Does anything happen?
Probably not. This is a federal agency! You know, they're part of the people who steal money out of your paycheck every month and give you nothing in return.

It unfortunate that these events happen, but it's a reality we have to face until the FCC does somethig about it.

-DD

--
__ Douglas A. Dever __ ak842@po.cwru.edu
QSO on 146.82/R anytime! s9000159@llohio.ll.pbs.org
73 de N8VUR

Date: Tue, 5 Apr 1994 13:01:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!psinntp!psinntp!
arrl.org!ehare@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CB interference and FCC...need help
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

darrylb@delphi.com wrote:

: I work for a local government agency as an engineer. Last week a lady
: called me complaining about interference from a local CBer (she thought
: he was a ham, at first). She called the FCC in Washington, and someone
: there told her to call whoever enforced the local building code. They
: told her that this local agency would measure the height of the CBer's
: tower.

: What can I do to help her? The FCC is obviously giving her the runaround.
: The CBer is interferring with her phone, television, and radios. Any comments
: here would be appreciated.

It's unfortunate that it is not a ham; we could locate a local
volunteer to help out.

I suggest that you download the following files from the ARRL
area at oak.oakland.edu, or get them by email from info@arrl.org :

rfigen.txt
tel.txt
rfiaudio.txt
tvi.txt
catvi.txt
rfisource.txt

These info files will explain most of the issues and tell how
to get started to fix the problems. While some of the TVI could
well be caused by spurious emissions from the transmitter, much
of what is described is fundamental overload. The only way to
improve the latter is to add filtering and/or shielding to the
affected equipment.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

--

Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org
My electronic posts and email do not necessarily represent the policy
of the ARRL, but I can probably get in trouble for them anyway!

Date: Tue, 5 Apr 1994 16:02:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!cnn.exu.ericsson.se!ericom!
eua.ericsson.se!sunnic!psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org!ehare@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FTP-able copy of AX.25 standard?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Johnny B. (mrmoose@netcom.com) wrote:

: I'm too cheap (well, perhaps, "too cheap" is not an
: operative phrase in ham lingo) to buy a book with
: a description of AX.25. Besides I'm a regulation
: kinda guy, and I would like to have a look at the
: official...(drum roll, please)...

: "American Radio Relay League, Inc., AX. 25 Amateur
: Packet-Radio Link-Layer Protocol, Version 2.0,
: October 1984 (or compatible),"

Well, the "official" version is in the ARRL book, AX.25
Link Layer Protocol. :-) An electronic version is available
from the email server info@arrl.org or the ftp site at
oak.oakland.edu arrl area. You need the files ax25-1.doc and
ax25-2.doc (check case at oakland).

: as quoted from my FTP'ed version of Part 97. I am
: assuming, of course, that my copy of Part 97 is
: citing the most recent revision of AX.25.

We also sell the FCC Rule book, which contains, among other things,
a copy of Part 97. :-).

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

--
Ed Hare, KA1CV, ARRL Laboratory, 225 Main, Newington, CT 06111
203-666-1541 ehare@arrl.org
My electronic posts and email do not necessarily represent the policy
of the ARRL, but I can probably get in trouble for them anyway!

Date: Fri, 1 Apr 1994 01:35:07 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!convex!cnn.exu.ericsson.se!ericom!
eua.ericsson.se!sunic!psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing (Fire Extinguisher)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ken A. Nishimura (kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU) wrote:

YYYq: OK, time to put the flames out on this one....

: I retract my suggestion about moving incentive licensing
: to the VHF+ bands. It was a thought based on "if incentive
: licensing is good on HF, how could it be implemented on VHF+"

: Anyhow, in all the discussion, one point still remains....

: Protection of new transmission standards is done through band
: plans, which are constantly under pressure from FM repeaters.
: There is space in 1240 to play NOW, will it be there in 2 years?
: If a frequency coordinator has to make a decision about
: whether to preserve a occassionally used play area and putting 50
: more FM repeaters in, guess who wins?

: Several people have told me that 10GHZ is the place to go.
: Well it is, if the goal is to make a QSO and use equipment
: that is give or take a few MHz. What about systems that are
: truly spectrum efficient and use complex frequency synthesizers?
: They aren't readily available to the ham community at 10GHz.

: There is plenty of work being done in the commercial world for
: the PCS bands for digital communications that I think would be
: great for ham bands. They are pushing the state of the art at 1.8
: GHz. 10 GHz is out of the question. If I make efforts to
: make this work in the ham bands in 1240, is my slice of the spectrum
: going to be there? I guess what I am looking for is a long
: term commitment from the band planners. There is 60 MHz
: of spectrum in 1280, all that would probably be needed is 2 MHz
: in a duplex pair, though much work is TDMA simplex....

: Anyhow, if there is going to be any more discussion about this,
: please rename the subject line to "Band Plans of the Future" or
: something like that.

: Apologies to those that were offended.

: Ken

--

Zack Lau KH6CP/1

2 way QRP WAS
8 States on 10 GHz

Internet: zlau@arrl.org 10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: 5 Apr 94 16:30:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about ID'ing...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

K7ITM (no name) wrote...

>The copies of FCC regulations I can easily lay my hands on are
>getting a bit old (yeah, I know, I ought to update them), so
>something I'm noticing locally on 440 has me very curious:
>
>What are the current regulations about required identification
>of transmissions from repeaters? Is there anything band-
>specific in them?
>
>It appears that several local repeaters (including what one
>might call unidirectional cross-band repeaters, used to
>link remote 2m receivers to the 2m repeater they serve) don't
>ever ID, and somehow that doesn't seem right.
>
>73,
>K7ITM

The current regs require that ALL stations ID at least every 10 minutes in voice
or CW, not to exceed 20 WPM. ATV (450MHz and above) may ID within the picture
that they are sending. SSTV is still required to ID via CW or voice.
Generally the ID
for a repeater that has a 450 (or whatever) cross link can be done on the cross link.
That way both the cross link and the main output send the ID.
ex:
146.34/146.94 repeater with an auxiliary receiver somewhere else -
The aux receiver is linked to the main transmitter on 445.10 Mhz. The 445.10 transmitter sends the ID for the repeater, thus the transmitter transmits
the ID for the main repeater (146.34) so that both the 445.10 and 146.34 transmitters
are ID'ed. One can also have an id on the main transmitter (146.34) also.

If your 2m repeater is not ID'ing, you should let the trustee know. As far as I know, they are in violation of FCC rules.

Kevin (WB5RUE)

Date: 5 Apr 94 21:54:53 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!newshub.nosc.mil!crash!telesoft!ignite!
garym@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Question about ID'ing...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <CnrBwr.6LG@hpcvsnz.cv.hp.com> tomb@lsid.hp.com (Tom Bruhns) writes:
>What are the current regulations about required identification
>of transmissions from repeaters? Is there anything band-
>specific in them?

Basically every 10 minutes or at the end of a conversation. No.

>It appears that several local repeaters (including what one
>might call unidirectional cross-band repeaters, used to
>link remote 2m receivers to the 2m repeater they serve) don't
>ever ID, and somehow that doesn't seem right.

Every transmitter must be identified (except space or telecommand stations).

Do you have CTCSS decode programmed on your radio? If so, it's possible
that the repeater isn't transmitting a PL tone while it ID's. Some system
do this.

It could also be identifying with Morse code that you aren't hearing on your
radio. If your radio (or speaker) filters out audio below 300 hz and their
CW ID audio is at 250hz, you won't hear it.

The other possibility is that they just aren't identifying as required.

A lot of dual band radios on the market today have cross band repeat
capability but totally ignore the ID requirements. I've been trying to
figure out a way to add an ID'er to my TM-742 for cross band repeat but
there doesn't seem to be a way. I have to ID it manually on both bands.
--GaryM

Date: 5 Apr 1994 14:37:04 GMT
From: koriel!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Apr1.142818.25552@emba.uvm.edu>, <765221426snx@skyld.grendel.com>, <Cnno4p.Fyr@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: 40 meter Broadcast QRM

In article <Cnno4p.Fyr@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>In article <765221426snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:
>>
>>In article <1994Apr1.142818.25552@emba.uvm.edu> gdavis@grieffin.emba.uvm.edu writes:
>>
>> > It's amazing that after years of IARU work we still must, more or less,
>> > live with the megawatt AM broadcasters.
>>
>> Yeah, good thing we'd never stoop to that.
>>
>> I wonder where VOA have their antennas pointed?
>
>The VOA mostly uses remote xmtr sites close to their target countries.
>For example, their bcsts directed to Viet Nam are transmitted from
>a site in the Philippines. Antennas are oriented towards the target
>countries.
>
>Jeff NH6IL

I wonder which countries the (very impressive) VOA site in Delano, CA that I drove past yesterday transmits to?

--
* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #163
